

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\* \* \*

NORMAN SHAW, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SCOTT DAVIS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:18-CV-00551-MMD-CLB

**ORDER REGARDING IN CAMERA  
DOCUMENT REVIEW**

On August 31, 2021, the Court ordered Defendants to submit certain documents in camera related to specific requests for production of documents served by Shaw on Defendant LeGrand. (ECF No. 179.) The Court received the documents on September 29, 2021 and has completed its review. Defendants are ordered to supplement their responses to Shaw's requests for production, as detailed below.

**I. Legrand Request for Production of Documents 8-10 (Set 16)**

At the conclusion section of the Court's Order ECF No. 179, it appears the Court erroneously indicated that these documents should be provided in camera for the Court's review prior to disclosure to Plaintiffs. (ECF No. 179 at 22.) However, in the body of the order, these documents were not required to be provided in camera prior to their disclosure. (ECF No. 179 at 16.) Out of an abundance of caution, however, the Court did conduct an in camera review of these documents. The Court finds that these documents do not contain any confidential information or information that would cause any security concerns. Therefore, the Court orders Defendants to provide the documents in their supplement to Shaw's Request for Production of Documents 8-10 (Set 16).

**II. Legrand Request for Production of Documents 16-18 and 20 (Set 41)**

Defendants originally objected to producing documents responsive to Shaw's Request to Production of Documents 16-18 and 20 (Set 41) to LeGrand because they claimed the documents were "confidential," contained "sensitive information about other

inmates,” and/or the “official information privilege” applied. (ECF No. 179 at 17.) Shaw requested the Court conduct an in camera review of these documents, and Defendants agreed. Thus, the Court ordered LeGrand to submit documents responsive to Shaw’s Request for Production of Documents 16-18 and 20 (Set 41), in camera, for the Court’s review. (ECF No. 179 at 22.)

Having completed that review, the Court sustains Defendants’ objections in part, and overrules Defendants’ objections in part. The Court finds that some of the documents do contain confidential and sensitive information that should not be disclosed. However, the Court also finds that some of the documents, or parts of the documents, do not contain confidential or privileged information and should be disclosed either in their entirety, or with appropriate redactions.

Therefore, the Court orders Defendants to supplement their responses to Shaw’s Request for Production of Documents 16-18 and 20 (Set 41) as follows:

Bates Number	Disclosure required:	If must be disclosed, redactions required:
51 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	1. All inmate information, including name and inmate number 2. All Staff information
52	Yes	No redactions
53-57	Yes	1. All inmate information, including name and inmate number 2. All Staff information

---

<sup>1</sup> The full “Bates Label” for this document is “Shaw 551: Def. LeGrand Supp. Reps. To RFPD [2] – 51.” However, for the sake of brevity, the Court will only refer to page number listed at the end of the applicable Bates Label in this above table for this number and all others.

<b>Bates Number</b>	<b>Disclosure required:</b>	<b>If must be disclosed, redactions required:</b>
58	Yes	1. Names reporting party and entering party
59-78	Yes	No redactions
79	Yes	1. Names reporting party and entering party 2. All inmate information, including name and inmate number 3. All Staff information
80-81	Yes	No redactions
82-86	No	N/A
87-89	Yes	1. Names reporting party and entering party 2. All inmate information, including name and inmate number 3. Staff names and information 4. Offending Party Name and Information 5. Witness Names and Information

Bates Number	Disclosure required:	If must be disclosed, redactions required:
91	Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Email header information related to "From" "To" "CC'd" names</li> <li>2. Specific Unit Information in paragraphs 1 and 2 of email</li> <li>3. Chapel Room Number and reference to specific religion conducting service referenced in second to last sentence of Paragraph 2 of email</li> <li>4. All inmate information, including names and inmate numbers</li> <li>5. All witness names and information</li> <li>6. All reporting party's names and information</li> </ol>
92	Yes	All information in Sender's Email Signature Block
93-100	No	N/A
101	Yes	No redactions

### III. CONCLUSION

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Defendants shall supplement their responses to LeGrand Requests for Production 8-10 (Set 16) and 16-18 and 20 (Set 41), as detailed above. Defendants shall provide these supplement documents within 14 days from the date of this order.

**DATED:** October 4, 2021.

  
**UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**